

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**ALABAMA STATE CONFERENCE OF
THE NAACP, et al.,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**STEVE MARSHALL, in his official
capacity as Alabama Attorney General, et
al.,**

Defendants.

}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00420-RDP

ORDER

This matter is before the court on the parties' Joint Motion to Modify Deadlines and Page Limitations. (Doc. # 32).

Plaintiffs Alabama State Conference of the NAACP, League of Women Voters of Alabama, League of Women Voters of Alabama Education Fund, Greater Birmingham Ministries, and Alabama Disabilities Advocacy Program (collectively "Plaintiffs") filed this action on April 4, 2024 to challenge Alabama Senate Bill 1, a new law that restricts absentee ballot application assistance. (Doc. # 1). The Complaint originally asserted claims against a total of forty-four Defendants: Alabama Attorney General Steve Marshall; Alabama Secretary of State Wes Allen; and forty-two District Attorneys in the state of Alabama ("District Attorney Defendants"). (*Id.*).


On April 15, 2024, in an effort to streamline the matter, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss the District Attorney Defendants from this action. (Doc. # 25). On April 16, 2024, the court entered a Pro Tanto Dismissal Order dismissing the District Attorney Defendants from the action. (Doc. # 30). As a result, Plaintiffs currently assert claims against only two defendants: Alabama Attorney General Steve Marshall and Alabama Secretary of State Wes Allen. (*Id.*).

On April 30, 2024, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Modify Deadlines and Page Limitations (the “Joint Motion”) (Doc. # 32), in which they informed the court that, in the next few weeks, Defendants intend to file a motion to dismiss, and Plaintiffs intend to file a motion for a preliminary injunction. (*Id.*). The Joint Motion requests the court to extend Defendants’ responsive pleading deadline from May 6, 2024 to May 20, 2024 in anticipation of their filing of a motion to dismiss. (*Id.*). Similarly, the Joint Motion seeks to enlarge the page limitations for briefing on Defendants’ anticipated motion to dismiss and Plaintiffs’ anticipated motion for preliminary injunction. (*Id.* at 2). Finally, the Joint Motion asks the court to stay the parties’ Rule 26(f) deadline currently scheduled for May 16, 2024 until after the anticipated motions have been ruled on. (*Id.*).

After careful review, and for good cause shown, the parties’ Joint Motion (Doc. # 32) is **GRANTED**. It is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

- I. Defendants’ response to Plaintiffs’ Complaint (Doc. # 1) **SHALL** be filed **on or before Monday, May 20, 2024**.
- II. The page limitations for upcoming motions and briefing **SHALL** be as follows:
 - a. Initial Briefs in support and Responsive Briefs in opposition are not to exceed **fifty (50) pages**.
 - b. Reply Briefs, if any, are not to exceed **twenty-five (25) pages**.
- III. The parties’ Rule 26(f) deadline scheduled for May 16, 2024 is **STAYED** pending resolution of the anticipated motions.

DONE and **ORDERED** this May 3, 2024.


R. DAVID PROCTOR
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE